

## New York Tribune.

First to Last—The Truth—News—Editorial—Advertisements.

SATURDAY, OCTOBER 9, 1915.

Owned and published daily by The Tribune Association, a New York corporation, at No. 14 Nassau Street, New York. Entered as second-class matter, October 3, 1879, under post office No. 145, New York, New York. Post office at New York, New York, under No. 145, New York, New York. Accepted for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on October 10, 1917. Payment in advance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on October 10, 1917.

**SUBSCRIPTION RATES:** By Mail, Postage Paid outside of New York City.  
 One Year, \$10.00; Six Months, \$6.00; Three Months, \$3.50; Single Copies, 10 Cents.  
**FOREIGN RATES:** By Mail, Postage Paid outside of New York City.  
 One Year, \$15.00; Six Months, \$9.00; Three Months, \$5.50; Single Copies, 15 Cents.  
**ADVERTISING RATES:** By Mail, Postage Paid outside of New York City.  
 One Year, \$10.00; Six Months, \$6.00; Three Months, \$3.50; Single Copies, 10 Cents.

You can purchase merchandise advertised in THE TRIBUNE with absolute safety—for it dissatisfies results in any case THE TRIBUNE guarantees to pay your money back upon request. No red tape, no quibbling. We make good promptly if the advertiser does not.

## Belgium and Greece.

At the close of the Second Balkan War Greece, Rumania and Serbia made an alliance, which amounted to an agreement to preserve the Treaty of Bucharest by joint action against Bulgaria should that nation attack any one of her three former foes. At the same time Greece and Serbia made an agreement which included the leasing of certain waterfront property in Salonica to Serbia and the recognition of Serbia's right to use that portion of the Salonica-Belgrade railroad which is in Greek territory, both in time of peace and of war.

By virtue of that agreement Serbia had, prior to the present crisis, been able to get both munitions of war and reinforcements of men, supplied by Great Britain and France. For many months both British and French troops have been passing from Salonica to Serbia.

In principle, therefore, there seems not the slightest difference between the earlier and the present situation save that France and Great Britain are now sending armies where before they sent only small detachments. To talk about the parallel between Greece and Belgium is, accordingly, to talk with utter disregard for the facts of the case.

Greece is now breaking her pledge to Serbia. It is wholly unfair to criticize Greece for taking such a course, because, when the treaty was made, it was against Bulgaria that she promised help. Now Bulgaria is only a minor detail and Germany and Austria are the main factors. It might be a glorious course for Greece to follow if she stood by her ally, but it would also imperil her existence, and criticism of King Constantine's policy is beside the mark.

On the other hand it is equally incorrect to compare Belgium and Greece, because Germany had no agreement with Belgium permitting her to use Belgian railroad lines and she had not, as Serbia has, exercised the right without question for months before the Great War began.

The decision of King Constantine is a terrible blow to the Allies; it imperils all their fortunes in the Near East. The chances favor the arrival of the Germans in Constantinople after a brief campaign in Serbia. But recognizing the success of German diplomacy and the probability of the triumph of German arms is a different thing from recognizing that the Allied operation at Salonica is the counterpart of that of the Germans at Liège. Greece may violate her pledge to Serbia to fight as an ally, but she cannot violate her pledge to permit the passage of men and munitions from Salonica without abandoning her neutrality and becoming in fact a Teutonic ally.

To judge from the reports from Athens that Greece is to adopt a policy of "benevolent neutrality," it would seem that Greece has no intention of giving the Allies any cause to use force in asserting the treaty rights of their little ally. In protesting, however, Greece has kept her own record clear with Berlin and Vienna, which fully realize Hellenic powerlessness in the face of Allied fleets.

## A Chance for Anti-Vaccinists.

The opponents of vaccination will make much of two deaths reported this week to the Board of Health. One occurred in Flushing, the other in Staten Island; tetanus was the cause in both cases, and in both the disease developed after vaccination. Obviously such cases call for a searching inquiry.

It is reasonable to attribute the deaths to vaccination in so far as there is little doubt that the vaccination wound was in each instance the seat of the infection. It would be unreasonable, however, to use these accidents as an argument against vaccination, just as it would be unreasonable to argue against surgery because operations are sometimes followed by infection.

The evidence tends to show that the wounds were neglected, and the presumption is that the tetanus was caused by a secondary infection. In one instance the virus was identical with that used by the physician in vaccinating two children of his own, who suffered no ill consequence. A sample has been given to the Board of Health, but it is unlikely that it will be found at fault. Tetanus bacilli have rarely if ever been detected in vaccine virus, whereas the possibilities of infection in other ways are numerous.

The child in one of the two cases was a coachman's daughter, a circumstance which suggests the proximity of stables, where tetanus germs often abound. It is not intimated in the newspaper reports that she did in fact play about the stables, but the possibility is indicated here only by way of providing against the less likely assumption that the vaccine was contaminated. When some years ago a few hundred deaths from tetanus occurred after the celebration of the Fourth of July it was not pretended by any one that gun powder was a common carrier of tetanus, for so obvious was it that children playing

about the streets have many opportunities to be infected that a fantastic explanation was unnecessary.

So it is in these cases. Vaccination is not a cause of tetanus; but a vaccination wound, like other wounds, may admit the germ of tetanus, and like other wounds vaccination wounds should be carefully guarded from infection.

## Alexander the Greatest.

If any person seriously questioned this country's Americanism he had only to watch the bulletin boards and the crowds surrounding them yesterday. The great American game had its innings, and war discussion was at a discount. The most unhappy people in the city—with the possible exception of some from the home of the Sacred Cod—were the professional German orators and the peddlers of war maps. "Alexander the Great"—a name on everybody's tongue—carried no war significance.

The first game of the world's series is bound to be merely an appetite-whetter. Unless the teams are unusually ill matched it is inconclusive. So, while Philadelphia has reason to be proud over Alexander's initial victory, Boston can put some conviction into the customary defiance of the defeated: "Well, watch us get after them next game!"

Baseball in these parts hasn't been a very inspiring affair and interest in it has languished. Yet it has only been dormant, and the eagerness with which the first game's details were sought proved that the American game still has its hold on the affections. Most of all, this mimic war was welcome as a relief from the grim horrors which have projected their gloom from across the seas. It found a country united to receive it. There are no hyphens in baseball.

## That Dangerous Military Tribunal.

It is difficult to take as seriously as does ex-Judge Cullen the Constitutional Convention's refusal to amend the Bill of Rights so as to declare specifically that civil courts shall be superior to military tribunals in their jurisdiction over civilians arrested for transgressing military rules. To demand the defeat of the new constitution, which, as he admits, contains many "advantageous provisions" lacking in the present document, solely because it omits this change seems to The Tribune so extreme as to be little short of fantastic.

Judge Cullen's arguments for the change are good—be that understood. It would have been better if this amendment, brought up in the closing hours of the session and only slightly debated, had been adopted. But there are other features equally good which were not adopted, and such omission must be true of every legislative body's work by the very nature of that work. It becomes, therefore, a question of the relative importance of this point which he raises compared with the importance of all the good features in the new document.

Judge Cullen asks the general public to throw aside provisions for a thoroughgoing department reorganization, for some shortening of the ballot by dispensing with certain elective state officers, for an executive-made budget and other important reforms in the state's financial methods; for court reforms which promise great hope of minimizing the law's delays, if not of eliminating them. He urges wage-workers, especially members of labor unions, to vote against a constitution containing a provision for extension of the workmen's compensation law to include compensation for occupational diseases and another prohibiting manufacture in tenement houses. Why? Because the Supreme Court of West Virginia held that a military tribunal had the right to try and punish offenders in time of riot, and Judge Cullen fears that the omission by the Constitutional Convention of this state will be held to vindicate this course.

New York State has existed without this provision Judge Cullen advocates for more than a century, and there seems as little probability that this issue will be raised in the future as there has been in the past. The new constitution remains in this respect just as is the one under which the state is now resting fairly safe and its citizens tolerably happy. Under such conditions it seems incredibly shortsighted to urge the sacrifice of the good things in the new constitution. A far more sensible course would be to adopt this constitution; then to amend it as Judge Cullen suggests—if the people really want that amendment.

## The Golden Crops of 1915.

The "biggest crop on record" is an old story in this country. We are used to seeing the totals of agricultural production rise from year to year and from decade to decade. We know also that from the point of view of the producer and from that of a nation seeking to market its surplus crops abroad a record breaking crop is not as profitable an achievement as on first blush it may seem to be. Under ordinary conditions maximum production is followed by a lowering of price averages. The cotton growers have had some unpleasant experiences with bumper crops. They have seen the price of their staple go down a third and have tried desperately by organization and agitation to reduce the South's cotton acreage.

It is the country's exceptional good fortune this year that, excluding cotton, the sale of which has been unavoidably limited by the war, our surplus crop is not in danger of encountering a glutted foreign market. Europe can feed itself less than ever next winter and the winter afterward, and our extra supply sold abroad will be sold at very profitable prices. The American farmer has been riding in a high power car for several years past. Now he can ride in two high power cars, for the war has freed him more than ever from the hampering conditions under which he lived in the eighties and nineties, when the price of wheat was far below the dollar line, corn had often to

be used as fuel and the mortgage on his land was about his only point of contact with the world of high finance.

The crops of 1915, magnificent as they now promise to be, will prove another bulwark to this country's financial position. If we are to feed the world we can also finance it. We shall not feel the burden of a couple of \$500,000,000 foreign loans if we continue to supply Europe's needs at a bigger profit than our farmers and manufacturers have ever made before on overseas business.

## Repeal the La Follette Law!

The administration's own agents continue to bear testimony to the shortsightedness and folly of the La Follette seamen's law, which President Wilson signed last winter when even a cursory reading of its provisions should have led him to veto it. His Department of Justice has tried to nullify by construction the attempts made in the law to regulate foreign shipping entering our ports. By giving the text a meaning which Congress did not intend it to have the Attorney General and his subordinates have avoided the general denunciation of our treaties of commerce with foreign countries which Mr. La Follette and his followers thought they had accomplished.

But other more strictly economic effects of the law are beyond the power of any administration official to counteract. For one thing, American shipping has been driven from the Pacific by the law's requirements as to the nationality of crews and the use of a common language. We have already handed over to Japan unchecked control of freight and passenger traffic in the Pacific. What this means may never have been understood in administration circles in Washington. But the United States Consul General in Hong Kong, an experienced student of Eastern affairs, knows what it means and has had the courage to tell the truth about it to his superiors. He says in a report just transmitted to the State Department:

There are not now, and so far as may be seen, sufficient vessels to carry American and other passengers between Asia and the United States, to carry American freight to its Eastern markets, or to carry Asiatic raw materials to American manufacturers, while postal service and all similar facilities of trade depending upon rapid and regular communication between the United States and the Far East can but be irregular and precarious for an indefinite period in the future. Whatever may be the cause or occasion for recent changes, the actual result of such changes has been the placing of American trade and American interests in the Far East in the greatest jeopardy.

That is a moderate statement of the damage done by a fool act, foolishly approved. One of the first duties of Congress when it reassembles should be to repeal the objectionable sections of the La Follette monstrosity.

Of course Dr. Williams means state examinations exclusively for those who enter the newspaper business from schools of journalism.

"I never was much of a hand at speculation."

—William Church Gilman.

Register! To-day is your last chance!

## Censuses of the Blind.

(From The Dundee Advertiser.)  
 The blind population of the United States in 1910 numbered 37,272, and blindness is less common in America than in most other countries. The total number of blind persons in the world is roughly estimated at 2,300,000. The total number enumerated at the most recent censuses of the blind in all countries in which such censuses have been taken is 1,194,346. The countries in which the rates of the blind to the total population are lower than that for the United States (62.3 per 100,000) are Canada, where the ratio was 44.9 per 100,000 in 1911; Belgium, where it was 43.5 in 1910; Denmark, 52.7 in 1911; Germany, 60.9 in 1910; Netherlands, 46.3 in 1909; New South Wales, 61.4 in 1911; Western Australia, 50.3 in 1911, and New Zealand, 47.5 in 1911.

## Grodnó.

(From The Westminster Gazette.)  
 Grodnó, round which there has been fierce fighting, is of historic importance, for it was in this town, in 1793, that the second partition of Poland was signed. On April 9 the Russian Minister, Sievers, published a manifesto declaring that his Sovereign, Queen Catherine, would incorporate with her dominions all the territory conquered by her arms. King Stanislaus Augustus, the last of the Polish kings, was therefore compelled to abdicate. In spite of his heroic resistance, he had to submit to the superior armies of Catherine and the King of Prussia. The town still retains the two palaces of the last Polish kings, and has besides two castles, one dating back to the twelfth century, and the other, a modern one, is used as a military hospital.

## Excise Arithmetic.

To the Editor of The Tribune.  
 Sir: As a persistent reader of The Tribune, especially since you have made your stand for "First to Last the Truth—News, Editorials, Advertisements," I am interested in your editorial, "Not a Net Loss." I am interested in the facts stated, but amused at your arithmetic. You say that 300 saloonkeepers failed to renew their licenses at the advanced fee of \$1,500 instead of \$1,200. This is interesting! You say this represents a loss of \$300,000, after saying that the city gets only half of the fees. Of course, the fact that the "officials of the liquor dealers' associations estimated that 600 saloons could not stand the 'raise' bears on the matter only as showing the accuracy (or honesty) of their estimate. But your arithmetic wanders yet further in failing to connote the fact that the city is ahead on the deal by just one-half the difference between the old fee of \$1,200 and the new fee of \$1,500 multiplied by the total number of saloons that had their licenses renewed, and as the number renewing was many more than the number failing to renew, it makes the case look as if it were a long way from a net loss of \$300,000!

H. H. H.  
 "H. H. H." is wrong, not The Tribune. The figure of \$500,000 was not The Tribune's estimate of the city's loss, but that of liquor men, figured on a basis of 600 failures to renew licenses, and that was distinctly stated in the editorial. "H. H. H." overlooks the fact that the city, under the law, gets no part of the extra \$300 in the new license fee. —Ed.]

## GERMAN AND BRITISH SINS

## Deliberate Murder Compared with Sharp Practice in Law.

To the Editor of The Tribune.  
 Sir: I have read with much interest Mr. W. T. Osborn's well written though misguided criticism of The Tribune. It appears that Mr. Osborn's reasoning must be classed with those hyphenated ones whose twisted and warped arguments are the despair of the readers of The Tribune. We all have a right to our own opinions, and we must admire the man with sufficient strength of character to oppose the popular mind. But there are certain rules of Christianity that brook no opposition, and he who runs counter to them is outside the pale.

Mr. Osborn in the usual hyphenated manner has confused cause and effect in the matter of the British and German blockades. If England must be blamed for an illegal blockade Germany must be blamed still more for allowing civil supplies to be requisitioned for military purposes—the cause of England's blockade.

If England's illegal blockade, threatening property, calls for protest, how much more should we protest against Germany's illegal blockade threatening both life and property! England's offense is hedged about by legal technicalities and precedents. Germany's course was direct and its result a crime of enormous magnitude. There was no need to wait for facts; the intention was avowed and the act acknowledged on the same day. A murderer confessing his guilt is tried only as a matter of form—the law takes its course. No need to argue on legal questions, no need to ask whether there was any precedent for such a deed. The same day the crime was committed, the same day was Germany condemned by all Christians.

Grounds there certainly are for strong protest against England's interference with neutral shipping, but there are points involved which do not show themselves on the surface. It may be months more before all the facts are established, and very likely the whole matter will end in a court of arbitration. Not because we are biased in favor of England, but because her action involved not human lives, but property; because there is room to doubt, or at least argue, the legality of her course.

As to Mr. Osborn's belittling of the "invasion of Belgium," I believe it is true that The Tribune did not call on the President to protest against it at the time. But I think the United States was too stunned to realize what was being done. The Tribune has since grasped the fact that an opportunity of upholding national honor has been allowed to go by, a mistake which gave Germany, with its twisted perversion, the idea that we did not care. As to our right to protest without "butting in," of that there is no question. As one of the signatories of the Hague treaty our right to protest against that treaty being regarded as a "scrap of paper" is unquestioned. As to the fact that other countries have allowed themselves to be used as conveniences against their neighbors during war, that does not affect Belgium's case at all. If Luxembourg allowed herself through fear of destruction to be bought, that does not make it reasonable that the guarantors of Belgian neutrality should look with indifference upon Belgian destruction.

Mr. Osborn is evidently in sympathy with the "might makes right" element.

W. C. SYMONS.

Elmhurst, L. I., Oct. 1, 1915.

## The Hyphenated Menace Here.

To the Editor of The Tribune.  
 Sir: The recent letter in your paper which pointed out the possible danger from sudden concentrated action in this city by the pro-Germans in event of a war with Germany is among the most noteworthy communications I have read. The bitter spirit and great numbers, the extreme classiness and the degree to which possibly 100,000 German-Americans (not American-Germans) have been trained in military duties, and the extent to which they have weapons, make them a dreadful menace to the welfare of this city, so rich in loot.

The number of the National Guard and of the police, many of whom have German sympathies, is too small to be effective against a sudden and concentrated attack by those who gleamed over the devastation of Belgium and the wrecking of passenger ships.

Enough has been publicly declared by the Riddick and Virecks to convince us that only opportunity and a state of war would be needed to bring on such an attack. What guarding has been provided for the treasury, the banks, and other places for the most tempting plunder in the world? Or what to protect the men who would be seized as hostages?

Has anything been done to disarm or disarm the organizations which have diligently attacked or sought to destroy our neutrality? For the comfort of our people at large adequate preparation for defense or attack, for disarmament or deportation should be made. Or, if already made by President, or Governor, or Mayor, the public should be told of it.

J. C. C.

Brooklyn, Oct. 2, 1915.

## The Allied Landing in Greece.

To the Editor of The Tribune.  
 Sir: It is asserted by the Teutons with some degree of confidence that the landing of troops by the Allied powers at Salonica, whereby the neutrality of Greece was technically violated, bears a strong resemblance to the invasion of Belgium by the Huns. At first blush it may so appear to the superficial mind. Reflection, however, will at once disclose the fallacy of the proposition. The neutrality of Belgium was guaranteed by the very power which despoiled it.

No such situation confronted the Allies in the case of Greece. Her case can reasonably be compared with that of Luxembourg, when that country was invaded by the German hordes over her protest, the only distinction being that the protest of Luxembourg was apparently sincere, while that of Greece was merely formal and a mockery. Neither did Luxembourg shower roses upon the invading barbarians as did Greece, when she extended her cordial welcome to the gallant French warriors. Besides, Greece is bound by treaty to come to the assistance of Serbia in her defense against Bulgaria, and the Allied troops are assisting Greece in the performance of that sacred treaty obligation.

A NEUTRAL.

New York, Oct. 7, 1915.

## Trust the President More.

To the Editor of The Tribune.  
 Sir: It is only natural for a President, upon whom rests the duty of deciding international issues, to be much criticized.

In the light of our defenseless condition, if President Wilson has kept the United States from war, he has done well; if he has invited hostility by a show of weakness, he has erred. But who knows?

Who is truly able to judge whether Roosevelt, Taft, McKinley or Lincoln would have acted more wisely? Germany has been no respecter of persons. Who knows to-day's facts better than the President—the underlying facts?

If we trust him more Europe will respect us as a nation more.

GEORGE CHITTENDEN TURNER.

Brooklyn, Oct. 4, 1915.

## ONE CASE WHERE WATCHFUL WAITING WON.



## A BRITISH OPINION

Comment of "The London Times" on the Washington Correspondence of The Tribune—American Policy in English Eyes.

Austria, it would seem, has bowed to America's demand for the recall, pure and simple, of Dr. Dumba. President Wilson rightly refused to assent to proposals for disguising the real character of this salutary measure of discipline by allowing the ambassador, who had abused his position, to be withdrawn on the pretext of leave of absence from his post. The surrender of the Ballplatz, when it is understood that Washington was in earnest, is a timely illustration of the advantage of firmness in the support of just and reasonable diplomatic claims. A recent article in The New York Tribune by Mr. Frank H. Simonds, the editor of that journal, appears to show that some thoughtful American observers are sensible of this advantage and would fain see the steadfastness to which Washington owes its success in the Dumba incident extended to other and far more vital questions that are still unsolved. We do not suppose that the proportion of those who share the views of Mr. Simonds to the full is large, nor do we doubt that the policy which he criticizes still enjoys the approbation of the majority of the nation. The West and the masses, together with a certain number of "intellectual" pacifists, undoubtedly acquiesce in the attitude hitherto adopted by Mr. Wilson and give him their support. But the considered opinions of so acute a critic are too interesting and too suggestive to be ignored. The argument of the article is that the President is following two incompatible policies in regard to Germany, and that the combination of the two excludes the possibility of a pacific solution of the differences between the United States and that power. He is resolved, it is maintained, upon the one hand to assert for America the part of champion and defender of international law. He is not less resolved, on the other hand, to avoid everything which might "invite the criticism of the Southern and Middle Western constituencies, which, he feels certain, desire peace at any price." The immediate result, it is alleged, is mere drifting, and drifting, Mr. Simonds contends, will ultimately lead to that very war which it is sought to avert.

We need not follow the reasoning step by step, and we disclaim any intention to judge the justice of the conclusion. Mr. Simonds holds that before the sinking of the Lusitania in May America might have told Berlin that she meant to uphold international law in such wise as to convince Germany that this intention would be vindicated, if necessary, by war. In the alternative, America might have accepted the German conditions. "One policy would have been inspiring, the other safe." What was impossible was to combine the two. But that, it is urged, is just what Mr. Wilson tried to do. He took the highest possible moral tone in defence of international law, and he allowed Berlin to see that he relied on moral force alone and that he had not even considered the question of fighting. Then came the successive outrages upon the Lusitania, the Arabic and the Hesperian. The President could not recede from the ground he had taken up. In the face of his own words about "strict accountability," that would have been "a supreme national humiliation." He would not take "drastic action," for the South and West favored "peace at any price." He wrote notes, and "teach necessarily asserted American championship of international law more sharply," and defined the issues in controversy more clearly than its predecessor. At one moment anxiety was relieved by the Bernstorff promise, but the worthlessness of the promise was promptly shown by the sinking of the Hesperian, and was confirmed by the German note upon the Arabic. This document, as Mr. Simonds observes, proved that while Germany was ready to recognize the doctrine for which America contends she was determined to go on violating it in practice, producing an explanation for American consumption in each specific case. In the American public's judgment, either Germany must make "a complete and humiliating surrender" or Mr. Wilson must make an

equally complete abdication of the right to champion international law. The Arabic incident may probably be got over, but "there is no prospect that there will not be another," and if and when it happens the tension will become extreme. Mr. Simonds predicts war. We altogether doubt the prediction, but we agree that, if war should come, it would be more likely to come as the result of outraged national pride than as the consequence of calculated policy.

There are signs in other quarters that some amongst the ablest of American thinkers are concerned for the effect which the attitude of their country may have upon her position amongst the nations at the end of the war. Men of this type realize that democracy is upon its trial not in Europe alone. Were it beaten in Europe, the great fundamental principles which it represents, upon which it is founded and on which all its noblest and brightest hopes depend, would lose credit and consideration throughout the world. Foremost amongst its aims are the extension of the reign of law and right to international affairs, and no government or people are more devoted to these aims or have worked harder for their attainment than the government and the people of the United States. The triumph of Germany, Austria and Turkey would involve the negation of these principles and the defeat of these aims. That is demonstrated not only by the code of international morals which these states openly profess, but by their action throughout the struggle, and very notably by Germany's cavalier treatment of American protests against her murderous methods of maritime war. What would be the bearing of a victory of the new "monarchical principle," as interpreted and applied by Prussia-Germany, upon democracy beyond the Atlantic? What will be the bearing of its defeat, if the world struggle should show that the United States have indeed adopted "the highest possible tone" in defence of international law, but that they have done no more? These are questions not for us but for Americans to answer, and the interest of Mr. Simonds' article is the indication it conveys that Americans are asking them and others inseparable from them. They are taking thought about the future prestige and moral character of their country, and they do well, for these invaluable elements of national greatness may easily be affected in so great a crisis. The German agents and emissaries will no doubt seek to misrepresent and to cut short all self-questionings of the kind, just as they have done no more. These are questions not for us but for Americans to answer, and the interest of Mr. Simonds' article is the indication it conveys that Americans are asking them and others inseparable from them. They are taking thought about the future prestige and moral character of their country, and they do well, for these invaluable elements of national greatness may easily be affected in so great a crisis. The German agents and emissaries will no doubt seek to misrepresent and to cut short all self-questionings of the kind, just as they have done no more. These are questions not for us but for Americans to answer, and the interest of Mr. Simonds' article is the indication it conveys that Americans are asking them and others inseparable from them. They are taking thought about the future prestige and moral character of their country, and they do well, for these invaluable elements of national greatness may easily be affected in so great a crisis. The German agents and emissaries will no doubt seek to misrepresent and to cut short all self-questionings of the kind, just as they have done no more. These are questions not for us but for Americans to answer, and the interest of Mr. Simonds' article is the indication it conveys that Americans are asking them and others inseparable from them. They are taking thought about the future prestige and moral character of their country, and they do well, for these invaluable elements of national greatness may easily be affected in so great a crisis. The German agents and emissaries will no doubt seek to misrepresent and to cut short all self-questionings of the kind, just as they have done no more. These are questions not for us but for Americans to answer, and the interest of Mr. Simonds' article is the indication it conveys that Americans are asking them and others inseparable from them. They are taking thought about the future prestige and moral character of their country, and they do well, for these invaluable elements of national greatness may easily be affected in so great a crisis. The German agents and emissaries will no doubt seek to misrepresent and to cut short all self-questionings of the kind, just as they have done no more. These are questions not for us but for Americans to answer, and the interest of Mr. Simonds' article is the indication it conveys that Americans are asking them and others inseparable from them. They are taking thought about the future prestige and moral character of their country, and they do well, for these invaluable elements of national greatness may easily be affected in so great a crisis. The German agents and emissaries will no doubt seek to misrepresent and to cut short all self-questionings of the kind, just as they have done no more. These are questions not for us but for Americans to answer, and the interest of Mr. Simonds' article is the indication it conveys that Americans are asking them and others inseparable from them. They are taking thought about the future prestige and moral character of their country, and they do well, for these invaluable elements of national greatness may easily be affected in so great a crisis. The German agents and emissaries will no doubt seek to misrepresent and to cut short all self-questionings of the kind, just as they have done no more. These are questions not for us but for Americans to answer, and the interest of Mr. Simonds' article is the indication it conveys that Americans are asking them and others inseparable from them. They are taking thought about the future prestige and moral character of their country, and they do well, for these invaluable elements of national greatness may easily be affected in so great a crisis. The German agents and emissaries will no doubt seek to misrepresent and to cut short all self-questionings of the kind, just as they have done no more. These are questions not for us but for Americans to answer, and the interest of Mr. Simonds' article is the indication it conveys that Americans are asking them and others inseparable from them. They are taking thought about the future prestige and moral character of their country, and they do well, for these invaluable elements of national greatness may easily be affected in so great a crisis. The German agents and emissaries will no doubt seek to misrepresent and to cut short all self-questionings of the kind, just as they have done no more. These are questions not for us but for Americans to answer, and the interest of Mr. Simonds' article is the indication it conveys that Americans are asking them and others inseparable from them. They are taking thought about the future prestige and moral character of their country, and they do well, for these invaluable elements of national greatness may easily be affected in so great a crisis. The German agents and emissaries will no doubt seek to misrepresent and to cut short all self-questionings of the kind, just as they have done no more. These are questions not for us but for Americans to answer, and the interest of Mr. Simonds' article is the indication it conveys that Americans are asking them and others inseparable from them. They are taking thought about the future prestige and moral character of their country, and they do well, for these invaluable elements of national greatness may easily be affected in so great a crisis. The German agents and emissaries will no doubt seek to misrepresent and to cut short all self-questionings of the kind, just as they have done no more. These are questions not for us but for Americans to answer, and the interest of Mr. Simonds' article is the indication it conveys that Americans are asking them and others inseparable from them. They are taking thought about the future prestige and moral character of their country, and they do well, for these invaluable elements of national greatness may easily be affected in so great a crisis. The German agents and emissaries will no doubt seek to misrepresent and to cut short all self-questionings of the kind, just as they have done no more. These are questions not for us but for Americans to answer, and the interest of Mr. Simonds' article is the indication it conveys that Americans are asking them and others inseparable from them. They are taking thought about the future prestige and moral character of their country, and they do well, for these invaluable elements of national greatness may easily be affected in so great a crisis. The German agents and emissaries will no doubt seek to misrepresent and to cut short all self-questionings of the kind, just as they have done no more. These are questions not for us but for Americans to answer, and the interest of Mr. Simonds' article is the indication it conveys that Americans are asking them and others inseparable from them. They are taking thought about the future prestige and moral character of their country, and they do well, for these invaluable elements of national greatness may easily be affected in so great a crisis. The German agents and emissaries will no doubt seek to misrepresent and to cut short all self-questionings of the kind, just as they have done no more. These are questions not for us but for Americans to answer, and the interest of Mr. Simonds' article is the indication it conveys that Americans are asking them and others inseparable from them. They are taking thought about the future prestige and moral character of their country, and they do well, for these invaluable elements of national greatness may easily be affected in so great a crisis. The German agents and emissaries will no doubt seek to misrepresent and to cut short all self-questionings of the kind, just as they have done no more. These are questions not for us but for Americans to answer, and the interest of Mr. Simonds' article is the indication it conveys that Americans are asking them and others inseparable from them. They are taking thought about the future prestige and moral character of their country, and they do well, for these invaluable elements of national greatness may easily be affected in so great a crisis. The German agents and emissaries will no doubt seek to misrepresent and to cut short all self-questionings of the kind, just as they have done no more. These are questions not for us but for Americans to answer, and the interest of Mr. Simonds' article is the indication it conveys that Americans are asking them and others inseparable from them. They are taking thought about the future prestige and moral character of their country, and they do well, for these invaluable elements of national greatness may easily be affected in so great a crisis. The German agents and emissaries will no doubt seek to misrepresent and to cut short all self-questionings of the kind, just as they have done no more. These are questions not for us but for Americans to answer, and the interest of Mr. Simonds' article is the indication it conveys that Americans are asking them and others inseparable from them. They are taking thought about the future prestige and moral character of their country, and they do well, for these invaluable elements of national greatness may easily be affected in so great a crisis. The German agents and emissaries will no doubt seek to misrepresent and to cut short all self-questionings of the kind, just as they have done no more. These are questions not for us but for Americans to answer, and the interest of Mr. Simonds' article is the indication it conveys that Americans are asking them and others inseparable from them. They are taking thought about the future prestige and moral character of their country, and they do well, for these invaluable elements of national greatness may easily be affected in so great a crisis. The German agents and emissaries will no doubt seek to misrepresent and to cut short all self-questionings of the kind, just as they have done no more. These are questions not for us but for Americans to answer, and the interest of Mr. Simonds' article is the indication it conveys that Americans are asking them and others inseparable from them. They are taking thought about the future prestige and moral character of their country, and they do well, for these invaluable elements of national greatness may easily be affected in so great a crisis. The German agents and emissaries will no doubt seek to misrepresent and to cut short all self-questionings of the kind, just as they have done no more. These are questions not for us but for Americans to answer, and the interest of Mr. Simonds' article is the indication it conveys that Americans are asking them and others inseparable from them. They are taking thought about the future prestige and moral character of their country, and they do well, for these invaluable elements of national greatness may easily be affected in so great a crisis. The German agents and emissaries will no doubt seek to misrepresent and to cut short all self-questionings of the kind, just as they have done no more. These are questions not for us but for Americans to answer, and the interest of Mr. Simonds' article is the indication it conveys that Americans are asking them and others inseparable from them. They are taking thought about the future prestige and moral character of their country, and they do well, for these invaluable elements of national greatness may easily be affected in so great a crisis. The German agents and emissaries will no doubt seek to misrepresent and to cut short all self-questionings of the kind, just as they have done no more. These are questions not for us but for Americans to answer, and the interest of Mr. Simonds' article is the indication it conveys that Americans are asking them and others inseparable from them. They are taking thought about the future prestige and moral character of their country, and they do well, for these invaluable elements of national greatness may easily be affected in so great a crisis. The German agents and emissaries will no doubt seek to misrepresent and to cut short all self-questionings of the kind, just as they have done no more. These are questions not for us but for Americans to answer, and the interest of Mr. Simonds' article is the indication it conveys that Americans are asking them and others inseparable from them